DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 823 FL 017 626

AUTHOR El-Banna, Adel Ibrahim
TITLE English Language Proficiency Levels among Non-Native EFL Teachers: An Exploratory Investigation.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 107p.; Appendix C contains marginally legible print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Needs; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Language Proficiency; *Language Teachers; *Reading Skills; Second Language Instruction; Sex Differences; Teacher Education; *Teacher Qualifications; Teaching Experience; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Egypt; Nonnative Speakers

ABSTRACT

A study compared the English language proficiency levels of three groups of non-native English-speakers who teach English as a second language (ESL) in Egypt. The three groups were: (1) graduates of a department that was not an English department; (2) graduates of English departments; and (3) seniors in one Egyptian university's English department. Teacher variables considered were ESL teaching experience, sex, teaching group, general English proficiency, writing skills, and reading skills. Analysis revealed that group 3 outperformed the others in general English language and reading proficiency, group 2 outperformed the others in writing proficiency, and group 1 were ranked last in all three language areas. No effects were found for experience or sex. Based on these findings, it is recommended that all ESL teachers be required to have formal training, with schools of education assuring that prospective teachers have specific competencies in the language before being allowed to teach it. Thirty-two tables and 62 references are included, and three appendixes provide copies of the language skills and writing proficiency tests administered during the study as well as sample by failed candidates (in Arabic). (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299823

University of Tanta
Faculty of Education

English Language Proficiency Levels Among Non-Native EFL Teachers: An Exploratory Investigation

by

ADEL I.EL-Banna, Ph.D
EFL Teaching & Testing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. El-Banna
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

(c) 1987
by Adel I.El-Banna

FL 017626

UNIVERSITY OF TANTA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY LEVELS AMONG NON-NATIVE EFL TEACHERS: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION

By
Adel I. El-Banna, Ph.D.
EFL Teaching & Testing

© 1987
By Adel I. El-Banna

ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY LEVELS AMONG NON-NATIVE TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION

Adel I. El-Banna
Tanta University, Faculty of Education

ABSTRACT

The teaching of English as a foreign language in our Egyptian schools is entrusted to three categories of EFL teachers, viz. a) University graduates of the English departments in Faculties of Arts, b) University graduates of the English departments in Faculties of Education, and University graduates of departments other than English.

Recognition is made of the fact that all EFL teachers must be proficient in the language they are teaching in their language classes. Today, there is a common complaint of the low standard of English among teachers of English as a foreign language in most schools. Therefore, EFL teachers English language proficiency must not and can not be overlooked.

The present investigation was conducted in an attempt to measure the English language proficiency of three groups of non-native teachers of English as a foreign language, namely regular EFL teachers, non-specialist EFL teachers and senior prospective EFL teachers in an English department. Comparisons were made to determine whether there were differences between the English proficiencies of the three groups. Comparisons were also made between the reading and writing proficiencies of the three groups. In addition, the reading subskills, and writing sub-skills of the three groups were investigated. An attempt was made to determine effect and interaction between EFL teachers experience, sex, specialization

and language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency. The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading Comprehension and The Five-Skill Writing Proficiency Test were administered in 1986, to a sample including 208 non-native EFL teachers. One way analysis of variance, A 2x2x2 analysis of variance, the t-test for independent groups and t-test for equal numbers were performed on the data. Research findings revealed significant differences between the three groups. Prospective EFL teachers outperformed both specilaist and non-specialist EFL teachers in the general English Language level and in reading proficiency level, whereas specialist EFL teachers were superior to both prospective EFL teachers and non-specialists in writing proficiency level, and non-specialists came last in their general language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency. No effects were found for experience and sex. However, an effect was revealed for a teacher's specialization and English language proficiency. No interactions were disclosed. On the basis of the findings, it is recommended that all teachers of English as a foreign language must receive formal training, and Faculties of Education must ensure that lincensees possess particular competencies in the language before being allowed to practice the profession. (Thirty-two tables are included).

INTRODUCTION

The role of the foreign language teacher is central to the learning process. This is because the quality of instruction within the school system is influenced by his or her language skills as well as language abilities. If teachers are weak in the use of the English language, then, it is probable that their learners will be affected by this weakness.

Therefore, teachers of a foreign language must be proficient in the language and an EFL teacher's language proficiency has to be of great importance to researchers. The importance of all teachers being competent in the use of the English language was emphasized by Nolan, Hayden and Malsbary (1967, P. 602) who maintained that "The English language is the principal tool of the teacher. Unless he can use English skillfully, he can not transfer his ideas to his students; and unless he can use English correctly, he will lose the respect of the school administration, of his fellow-teachers, and of his students". Smith (1968, P. 145) put it clearly that "Foreign language teachers must be proficient, not only in the language they teach but in related areas of culture, linguistics, and professional preparation". Finocchairo et al. (1973, P. 27) also pointed out that "It is vitally important that teachers of modern languages be adequately prepared for their task. Though a majority of the language teachers in our schools are well-trained, many have been poorly or inadequately prepared, often though no fault of their own".

At this point, the International Organization of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (1976) made it clear that "The success of any educational program depends on the commitment and preparation of the teachers involved. Successful language instruction must be carefully planned and implemented by qualified teachers, it can not be left to chance".

The teaching of English as a foreign language in our Egyptian schools is entrusted to three different types of EFL teachers: (a) University graduates of the English Departments in Faculties of Arts; (b) University graduates of the English Departments in Faculties of Education; and (c) University graduates of Departments other than English such as History, Geography, Sociology and philosophy, Eastern Studies, etc.

If teachers are graduates of the English Departments in the Faculties of Arts or Education, their knowledge of the language is often taken for granted. If, however, they are graduates of Departments other than English, their knowledge of the language cannot be taken for granted.

At present, there is a common complaint of the low standard of English among EFL teachers in most Egyptian schools. Badr (1984) indicated that "Through an analysis of the English Department curriculum in Faculties of Education, it was found that the English courses taught were not adequate in quantity or quality to provide the student teachers with the desired language proficiency". White (1986, P. 2) also pointed out that "Egypt has a huge number of English instructors whose background in language teching is weak and whose command of the language may be limited". El-Hinnawy (1986, P. 4) commented on this problem stating that "complaints of the inefficiency of our students in language is repeatedly voiced everywhere in higher education, government offices and private concerns". Cook (1986, P. 7) also stated that "Student teachers are now undertraining as far North as Al-Arish and as far South as Qena. But the inevitable price paid has been a fall in standards: Language tests and staff questionnaires confirm the common view that the ability in English of students. entering training has dropped considerably over the last decade and is still declining". In this concern, Daoud et al. (1986), P. 10) indicated that "Samples of work from first year students are so full of basic grammatical errors, limited vocabulary

and poor spelling.... ill-formed handwriting and poor punctuation". He added that "English graduates from both Education and Arts Faculties show a disturbing trend in their abilities.... No one likes to acknowledge the fall in standards too freely- neither teachers and their pupils nor lecturers and their students".

To clarify, this dilemma seems not only endemic to our Egyptian EFL teachers but is also evident among EFL/ESL teachers everywhere. Over the past decade, government agencies and the public have been exerting strong pressure to reverse what is perceived as a sharp decline in the quality of EFL/ESL teachers in the U.S. Charges have been made that the quality of EFL teachers in terms of academic competence is declining. For example, in New Mexico Crewdson (1979) reported that none of the state's 136 bilingual teachers could pass a fourth-grade level Spanish examination. The Dallas Independent School District in the U.S., the nation's eighth largest urban school district, disclosed that more than half of its 535 new teachers in 1976-1977 had failed a compentency test that is used to test the intelligence of those 13 years and older. A copy of test scores obtained by the Dallas Times Herald showed that administrators who took the test did even worse than a sample of high school students at a private school in North Dallas. Of the 535 teachers tested, 11 correctly answered ten or fewer of the sixty questions ("Disputes Embarrass Dallas's Educators, 1978, P. 21). Jorstad (1981, PP. 53-54) made it clear that "Programmes to train teachers for work in bilingual and ESL situations of a wide variety of types for people with diverse backgrounds are inadequate both in number and quality. While some use is made of minority individuals as resource teachers, many minority teachers are not trained to do much more than translate from native language into English and vice-versa". She concluded that "There is marked lack of preparation of teachers for language programmes..... Bilingual and ESL

teachers are often not trained for the special responsibilities" (P. 56).

Therefore, EFL teachers' language proficiency must not and can not be overlooked. Since the heart of any successful EFL programme is the teacher, non-native speakers who plan to become teachers of the target language or work as regular EFL teachers should be as proficient as possible in the language as well as in related areas of culture and linguistic theory.

Elewah (1978, P. 10) indicated that "The marked deterioration of the English language standard in our schools could be attributed to the poor qualifications of the teachers who teach the English language classes". At this point, Koerner (1963, PP. 34-35) pointed out that "If it is true that almost all imporvements in public schooling must start with the teachers themselves, or no improvements will be made, it is equally true of the teacher programmes in the colleges.

The language of non-native EFL teachers was of great concern to educators (Perren, 1968; Strevens, 1968; Savignon, 1976; Spencer, 1977; Altman, 1981; Politzer, 1981; Tucker, 1981; Jorstad, 1981; Badr, 1984; Badr, 1985). According to Strevens (1968, P. 209) teachers of English must have a knowledge of present day English and they must have equal competence in both writing and speech. Their level of proficiency must be high enough so that this knowledge can be made use of speedily and readily. However, "the teacher must know a great deal more than merely the "textbook" that he or she teaches in class".

Finally, since the future of the foreign language teaching depends so crucially upon the availability of welltrained and highly proficient teachers, there was special interest in the appraisal of the foreign language proficiency of those who planned to become EFL teachers and those who are actually teaching EFL in school whether they are graduates of English or non-English Departments.

Purpose of the study:

The heart of any successful EFL/ESL programme is the teacher. Teachers must have an acceptable command of both written and spoken English. Therefore, study of the English language should play an important part in their professional preparation. Recognition is made of the fact that teachers of a foreign language must have full mastery over English language skills. Since a difference in the English language proficiency of EFL teachers has been observed and not to mention the common complaint of the low level of English among them, the present study was designed in an attempt to measure the foreign language proficiency level of EFL teachers. It was hoped that one could arrive at some general conclusions about the actual state of foreign language in our schools.

This study is an exploratory investigation of three groups of non-native EFL teachers. There is concern that in Egypt, English is taught as a foreign language and not a second language, lack of exposure to the target language may cause deterioration in the teachers' language proficiency level and accordingly some teachers will lose their ability to function as good models for their students. In Egypt, contact with native speakers of English is rare or rather not available for some reasons. As a result, the classroom language of the teacher represents the basic part of the raw linguistic data to which the students are exposed. According to Gaies (1977), the language of the teacher could prove to be more significant that any text or course materials.

Moreover, the foreign language teacher is usually the only live model for his students. Therefore, his language proficiency should be of great importance. To conclude, then, the present investigation was undertaken in an attempt to evaluate the language proficiency level of three groups of EFL teachers. Of particular concern was the question of EFL teachers' control over reading and writing skills and their related

sub-skills. In addition, the question of determining interaction between EFL teachers' specialization, experience, sex and language proficiency level was studied.

In the present study, the general language proficiency level, the reading proficiency and the writing proficiency of non-specialist EFL teachers (group I) was compared to that of the two other groups; specialist EFL teachers (group II) and prospective EFL teachers (group III).

The need for this study was promoted by: (a) dearth of research work related to the foreign language proficiency of non-native teachers of English; (b) some differences that have been observed in EFL teachers' language proficiency level; (c) the difficulty of testing the foreign language skills of teachers as well as of students; and (d) EFL teachers' language proficiency must not and can not be overlooked in this age of the learner.

Research Questions:

The present study was carried out to give answers to the following questions:

1- Is there a difference between the three groups of EFL teachers in general language proficiency level?
2- Is there a difference between the three groups of EFL teachers in the reading skill and its sub-skills?
3- Is there a difference between the three groups of EFL teachers in the writing skill and its sub-skills?
4- Is there an effect for teachers' experience, sex and specialization on the general language proficiency level of the three groups?
5- Is there an interaction between teachers' experience, sex, specialization and general language proficiency level?

Instruments:

To obtain the necessary data for examining the validity of the hypotheses, the following tests were employed:

(A) The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading Comprehension for Non-Native Speakers of English (See Appendix A, in this volume). It was developed and validated by this author. It consists of five reading comprehension passages of graded length, and of varied themes. Each passage is followed by ten four multiple choice items measuring the following five reading sub-skills:

1- determining main ideas of the content;
2- understanding significant details of content;
3- drawing conclusions and inferences;
4- understanding structural meaning and syntax; and
5- determining meaning of words in context.

The total test reliability was calculated by employing Kuder Richardson 21. It was .79. The reliability of the test sub-tests were also calculated by using Kuder Richardson 21 (see table 5, in Appendix A in this volume). In addition, the test items' reliability were calculated by employing modal probability (El-Sayed, 1979, P. 650), (see table 4, in Appendix A in this volume).

The total test validity was estimated through a panel of experts and internal consistency validation. The test items validity was also calculated using point-biserial correlation (Hinkle et al. 1979, PP. 99-98). The test sub-tests validity were estimated, too.(see tables 1, 2, and 3 in Appendix A in this volume).

(B) The Five-Skill Writing Proficiency Test for Non-Native Speakers of English (see Appendix B, in this volume). It is selected by this author from Hill's Composition Book "Outline Composition Book". The subjects were asked to write a composition on the theme". A Road Accident". The subjects' composition samples were evaluated by two

experienced raters (Azzer, 1986; and Bishay, 1986), each holds a Ph. D degree either in language teaching or linguistics. The composition samples were corrected on the basis of fine categories. These were : (1) content; (2) organization; (3) vocabulary; (4) language use; and (5) mechanics. The two raters independently scored all the essays with scores and criteria based on an ESL Composition Profile (Newbury, 1981) (see Appendix B in this volume).

The total test reliability was achieved by using correlation coefficients of the two raters (Hinkle et al, 1979, P. 75). It was found to be .87. Moreover, the total test and sub-tests' reliability were achieved through Kuder Richardson 21. It was .84, and the reliability of sub-tests were as follows: .56 for content, .49 for organization, .50 for vocabulary, .69 for language use, .76 for mechanics (see table I, in Appendix B in this volume).

The test validity was reached through calculating correlation coefficients between each sub-test score and the total scores. These were: .63 for skill one, .58 for skill two, .67 for skill three, .76 for skill four; and .83 for skill five (see table 2, in Appendix B in this volume.)

Subjects:

The total sample used in this study was 208 non-native EFL teachers but 70 subjects were excluded because some of them did not complete the two tests administered to them. The excluded sample, however, was made use of when studying the subjects' general language proficiency level and in investigating their reading proficiency and writing proficiency. separately.

To clarify, the subjects used in studying EFL teachers' general language proficiency level were 138, divided into

three groups and all work as regular teachers of English as a foreign language in prep and secondary schools in Kafr El-Sheikh city excepting group three which comprises prospective EFL teachers who are going to work as regular EFL teachers immediately after graduation. Each group consisted of 46 subjects males and females. Group one (non-specialist EFL teachers) contained 40 males and 6 females who teach English as a foreign language and were graduates of non-English Departments. This group studied English as a suplementary course for two or four academic years, only a small number have had intensive English training at one of the training centers and may have gained some experience in language teaching. The second group (Specialist EFL teachers) embraced 46 subjects, 36 males and 10 females, who are graduates of the English Departments, and have some experience in teaching the language. Group three (prospective EFL teachers) included 46 subjects, 15 females and 31 males, who are senior students in the English Department at the Faculty of Education, Tanta University. They received some training (Practice teaching) in both preparatory and secondary schools. Immediately after graduation, they will be employed by the Ministry of Education as regular teachers of EFL.

With regard to the sample used in investigating EFL teachers' general language proficiency level in both reading and writing, 183 subjects, males and females were used. Group one consisted of 63 subjects, group two were 46 and group three included 74 subjects. As for the sample employed in studying EFL teachers' proficiency on the sub-skills of both reading proficiency and writing proficiency, 208 subjects were used. The first group included 61 subjects, males and females, group two consisted of 47 subjects, males and females, and group three were 100 subjects of both sexes.

Administration and Scoring:

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading Comprehension and The Five-Skill Writing Proficiency Test were administered to the whole sample in April-May 1986 by this author, and a well-trained research assistant. The tests were given in two separate sessions, 60 minutes each. The subjects recorded their answers to the reading test on separate answer sheets which were then scored manually by this author. During the same week, the subjects were administered the writing test. Instructions for this activity were common to all subjects, and consisted of a brief introduction of the topic followed by a period of time for the completion of the writing task. The subjects' written samples were scored by two raters who either hold a Ph. D in language teaching or a Ph. D in Linguistics. The scoring of the samples was based on scores and criteria provided by an ESL Composition Profile (see Appendix B, P. in this volume). Moreover, the subjects' written samples were also checked by this author.

It is very interesting to mention that testing the foreign language skills of EFL teachers proved very complex and difficult. Some EFL teachers refused to participate in the study, while others concealed the test booklets and never returned them to the author.

Results:

The investigation reported here studied and drew comparisons between the English language proficiency of three groups of EFL teachers. In addition, interaction between EFL teachers experience, sex, specialization, and language proficiency was studied. The effect of EFL teachers' experience, sex and specialization on language proficiency was also studied.

To test the differences, if any existed, between the groups, to determine interaction, and to study effects of the

study's variables, One Way Analysis of Variance (Hinkle, 1979, P. 242); Three Way Analysis of Variance (Hinkle, 1979, P. 322), the t-test for independent Groups (Hinkle, 1979, P. 207) and the t-test for equal numbers (El-Sayed, 1979, P. 467) were performed on the data. The analysis tested the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis one: There is no significant difference between the three groups in general language proficiency level.

Using ANOVA showed that significant differences did exist between the three groups in general language proficiency level at the .01 level as shown in table 1.

Table (1): ANOVA, General Language Proficiency Level Among the Three Groups

Source	S S	d.f	Ms	F
Between Groups	16719.65	3-1 = 2	8359.83	46.78**
Within Groups	24125.43	138-3 = 135	178.71	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Using the t-test revealed significant differences between group 1 (non-specialist EFL teachers) and group II (Specialist EFL teachers) at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 5.94); significant differences were also found between group I and group III (Prospective EFL teachers) at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 10.24); and significant differences existed between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 3.24) as indicated in table 2, P. 14. Accordingly, the first null hypothesis was rejected.

Table (2): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups in General Language Proficiency Level

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(1, II)	t(1, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	46	41.93	12.96			
Specialists	46	59.39	14.89	5.94**		
Prospective Teachers	46	68.5	11.61		10.24**	3.24**

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis two: There is no significant difference between the three groups in general reading proficiency level.

Using ANOVA indicated that significant differences existed between the groups in general reading proficiency level at the .01 level (see table 3).

Table (3): ANOVA for General Reading Proficiency Level Between Groups

Source	SS	d.f	MS	F
Among Groups	5560.84	3-1 = 2	2780.42	49.83**
Within Groups	11382.40	208-3 = 205	55.80	

** Significant at the .01 level.

The results of using the t-test showed that significant differences exist between group I and group II in favour of group II (t = 4.19), at the .01 level; significant differences

were also revealed between group I and group III in favour of group III (t = 10.07), at the .01 level; and significant differences were found between group II and group III in favour of group III (t = 3.72), at the .01 level (see table 4). Accordingly, hypothesis two was rejected.

Table (4): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups in General Reading Proficiency Level

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I&II)	t(I&III)	t(II&III)
Non-Specialists	61	20.54	7.56	F=1.39	F=1.37	F=1.90* t=3.72**
Specialists	47	27.25	8.9	t=4.19**	t=10.07**	t=2.39 t > t
Prospective Teachers..	100	32.65	6.46			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis three: There is no significant difference between the three groups on the following reading sub-tests:

1- Determining main ideas of the content;
2- Understanding significant details of content;
3- Drawing conclusions and inferences;
4- Understanding structural meaning and syntax; and
5- Determining meaning of words in context.

Using ANOVA revealed significant differences between the three groups on skill one, determining main ideas of the content, at the .01 level as shown in table 5.

Table (5): ANOVA for Reading Skill One, Determining Main Ideas of the Content Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	427.18	3-1= 2	213.59	62.09**
Within Groups	702.12	208-3= 205	3.44	

** Significant at the .01 level.

To determine the direction of differences, the t-test was used.

Table (6): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Reading Skill One

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I,III)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	61	4.98	2.17	F=1.04	F=2.34**	F=2.25**
					t=10.61**	t=5.30**
Specialists	47	6.48	2.13	t=3.45**	t`=2.36	t`=2.40
					t > t`	t > t`
Prospective Teachers	100	8.29	1.42			

** Significant at the .01 level.

The results of using the t-test in table 6 showed that significant differences were found between group I and group II, at the .01 level in favour of group II (t= 3.45); significant differences were also found between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 10.61); and significant differences existed between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 5.30).

Table (7): ANOVA for Reading Skill Two, Understanding Significant Details of Content Among Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	Ms	F
Among Groups	367.65	3-1= 2	183.83	48.25**
Within Groups	781.73	208-3=205	3.81	

** Significant at the .01 level.

The above table indicated significant differences between groups on skill two, understanding significant details of content at the .01 level.

When the t-test was used to determine the direction of differences, it revealed that significant differences existed between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 5.16); significant differences were also found between group I and group III in favour of group III (t=9.56); and significant differences were found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t=2.96), (see table 8,).

Table (8): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Reading Skill Two

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	61	3.96	1.94	F=1.23	F= 1.12	F= 1.23
Specialists	47	6.08	2.15	t=5.16**	t=9.56**	t= 2.96**
Prospective Teachers	100	7.08	1.83			

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (9): ANOVA For Reading Skill Three, Drawing Conclusions and Inferences Among the Groups

Source	SS	d.f	MS	F
Among Groups	120.13	3-1= 2	60.06	21.**
Within Groups	587.85	208-3=205	2.86	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As table 9 indicated, significant differences were found between groups at the .01 level on skill three, drawing conclusions and inferences.

Using the t-test in table 10, showed no significant differences between group I and group II. Significant differences, however, were found between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t= 5.80), and significant differences were also found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t= 4.15) as indicated in table 10.

Table (10): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Reading Skill Three

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	61	3.72	1.91	F= 1.28	F=1.58* t=5.80**	F= 1.24 t= 4.15**
Specialists	47	4.25	1.69	t= 1.44	t' =2.41 t > t'	
Prospective Teachers	100	5.39	1.52			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (11): ANOVA For Reading Skill Four, Understanding Structural Meaning and Syntax Among the groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	221.63	3-1= 2	110.82	33.48**
Within Groups	679.40	208-3= 205	3.31	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As shown in table II, significant differences existed between groups at the .01 level on skill four, understanding structural meaning and syntax.

The results of using the t-test revealed that there were significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 3.45); significant differences also existed between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III(t= 7.88); and significant differences were found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t= 3.41) as indicated in table 12.

Table (12): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Skill Four

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	61	3.91	1.98	F = 1 t=3.45**	F= 1.53* t=7.88**	F=1.53* t=3.41**
Specialists	47	5.29	1.98		t` =2.34 t > t`	t` =2.39 t > t
Prospective Teachers	100	6.32	1.60			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (13): ANOVA For Reading Skill Five, Determining Meanings of Words in Context Among the Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	145.42	3-2= 2	72.71	19.03**
Within Groups	782.59	208-3= 205	3.82	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As shown in table 13, ANOVA revealed significant differences among the three groups at the .01 level on skill five, determining meanings of words in context.

The results of the t-test indicated that there were significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 3.08), and significant differences were also found between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t= 5.74). No significant differences, however, were indicated between group II and group III as was made clear in table 14.

Table (14): The t-test For the Mean Differences Between Groups on Skill Five

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	61	3.93	1.68	F=1.79* t=3.08**	F=1.32 t=5.74**	F=1.36 t=1.49
Specialists	47	5.14	2.25	t'=2.41 $t > t'$		
Prospective Teachers	100	5.77	1.93			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

On the basis of the results presented in tables 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 the third null hypothesis was partly supported and partly rejected.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference between groups in general writing proficiency level.

Using ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences between groups at the .01 level as shown in table 15.

Table (15): ANOVA For General Writing Proficiency Level Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	5606.34	3-1= 2	2803.15	47.74**
Within Groups	10569.23	183-3= 180	58.72	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As shown in table 15, significant differences were revealed between the three groups at the .01 level in general writing proficiency level.

When the t-test was used, it indicated that significant differences exist between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 6.07); significant differences were also found between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 20.47); and significant differences were revealed

between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 3.47) as shown in table 16. Therefore, hypothesis four was rejected.

Table (16): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups in General Writing Proficiency

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	63	20.13	5.75	F=2.63**	F=1.84**	F=1.43
				t=6.07**	t=20.47**	t=3.47**
Specialists	46	29.56	9.32	t' =2.41	t' =2.39	
				t > t'	t > t'	
Prospective Teachers	74	23.67	7.79			

** Significant at the .01 level

Hypothesis Five: There is no significant difference between the three groups on the following writing sub-tests:

1- Content;
2- Organization;
3- Vocabulary;
4- Language use; and
5- Mechanics.

Using ANOVA showed that there were significant differences between the three groups at the .01 level on skill one, content as indicated in table 17.

Table (17): ANOVA For Writing Skill One, Content Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	153.40	3-1= 2	76.70	15.62**
Within Groups	883.44	183-3= 180	4.91	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Using the t-test revealed significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t= 5.27); and significant differences were also found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t= 4.48). No significant differences, however, were found between group I and group III as shown in table 18.

Table (18): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Writing Skill One

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	63	7.44	1.8	F=1.79* t=5.27**	F=1.73* t=.20	F=1.04 t=4.48**
Specialists	46	9.66	2.41	t'=2.42 $t > t'$	t'=2.39 $t > t'$	
Prospective Teachers	74	7.51	2.36			

* Significant at the .05 level.
** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (19): ANOVA for Writing Skill Two, Organization Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	95.27	3-1= 2	47.63	19.52**
Within Groups	439.06	183-3= 180	2.44	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As shown in table 19, significant differences were found between groups at the .01 level on writing skill two, organization. To determine the direction of differences, the t-test was used. It indicated that significant differences exist between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 5.46); significant differences were also found between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 4.26); and significant differences were revealed between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 2.51) as indicated in table 20.

Table (20): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Writing Skill Two

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II))	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-specialists	63	4.05	1.07	F=3.63** t=5.46	F=2.07** t=4.26	F=1.75* t=2.51**
Specialists	46	5.85	2.04	t' =2.39 $t > t'$	t' =2.39 $t > t'$	t' =2.37 $t > t'$
Prospective Teachers	74	4.97	1.54			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (21): ANOVA for Writing Skill Three, Vocabulary Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	94.75	3-1= 2	47.38	17.81**
Within Groups	479.50	183-3= 180	2.66	

* Significant at the .01 level.

As table 21 indicates, significant differences existed between groups at the .01 level on writing skill three, vocabulary.

The results of using the t-test in table 22 indicated that there were significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 5.79); significant differences were indicated between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t=3.46); and significant differences were revealed between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t=2.81), as shown in table 22.

Table (22): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Writing Skill Three, Vocabulary

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	63	4.07	1.20	F=2.64** t=5.79**	F=2.01** t=3.46**	F=1.32 t=2.81**
Specialists	46	5.95	1.95	t' =2.37 $t > t'$	$\tilde{t}$ =2.39 $t > t'$	
Prospective Teachers	74	4.93	1.70			

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (23): ANOVA For Writing Skill Four, Language Use Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	238.33	3-1= 2	119.16	18.56**
Within Groups	1155.79	183-3= 180	6.42	

** Significant at the .01 level.

In the above table, ANOVA indicated significant differences between groups at the .01 level on writing skill four, language use. The t-test results revealed significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 5.74); significant differences also existed between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t = 3.92); and significant differences were found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 2.65) as shown in table 24.

Table (24): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Writing Skill Four, Language Use

Groups \ Data	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	63	3.48	1.99	F=2.39** t=5.74**	F=1.60* t=3.92**	F=1.49 t=2.65**
Specialists	46	6.46	3.08	t`=2.39 t > t`	t`=2.39 t > t`	
Prospective Teachers	74	4.99	2.52			

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (25): ANOVA, for Writing Skill, Mechanics Among the Three Groups

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Among Groups	4.47	3-1= 2	2.24	10.67**
Within Groups	39.16	183-3= 180	.21	

** Significant at the .01 level.

As indicated in table 25, significant differences between groups were found at the .01 level on writing skill five, mechanics.

Employing the t-test showed that there were significant differences between group I and group II at the .01 level in favour of group II (t= 5.04); significant differences existed between group I and group III at the .01 level in favour of group III (t= 3.15); and significant differences were found between group II and group III at the .01 level in favour of group II (t = 2.37) as shown in table 26.

Table (26): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Groups on Writing Skill Five, Mechanics

Data / Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	t(I, II)	t(I, III)	t(II, III)
Non-Specialists	63	1.13	0.32	F=3.17** t=5.04**	F=2.34** t=3.15**	F=1.35 t=2.37**
Specialists	46	1.60	0.57	$\bar{t}$ =2.39 t > $\bar{t}$	$\bar{t}$ =2.39 t > $\bar{t}$	
Prospective Teachers	74	1.35	0.49			

** Significant at the .01 level.

On the basis of the results presented in tables 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 hypothesis five was partly supported and partly rejected.

Hypothesis six: There is no effect for experience, sex and specialization on EFL teachers' general language proficiency level.

Using ANOVA (2x2x2) revealed no effects for experience or sex on EFL teachers' language proficiency level. Significant effect, however, was found for specialization at the .01 level as shown in table 27, P. 28; Accordingly, hypothesis six was partly supported and partly rejected.

The t-test results indicated that significant differences existed between non-specialist EFL teachers and specialist EFL teachers at the .01 level in favour of specialist EFL teachers (t = 5.94) as shown in table 28, P. 29.

Table (27): ANOVA (2x2x2) For Effects and Interaction Between Experience, Sex, Specialization, and Language Proficiency Level of Regular EFL Teachers

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
A- Experience	502.84	2-1= 1	502.84	2.58
B- Sex	16.49	1	16.49	0.08
C- Speciality	3109.09	1	3109.09	15.95**
AxB	15.28	1x1= 1	15.28	0.08
AxC	127.71	1	127.71	0.66
BxC	222.90	1	222.90	1.14
AxBxC	137.47	1	137.47	0.71
Within Groups	16375.46	92-8= 84	194.95	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (28): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Non-specialist and Specialist EFL Teachers in General Language Proficiency Level

Groups \ Data	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
I- Non-Specialists	41.93	12.96	5.94**
II- Specialists	59.39	14.89	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis Seven: There is no interaction between experience, Sex, Specialization and EFL teachers language proficiency level.

Using ANOVA (2x2x2) indicated no interaction as shown in table 27, P. 28. Therefore, hypothesis seven was accepted.

Hypothesis eight: There is no effect for experience, sex and Specializatiçn on EFL teachers' reading Proficiency Level.

The results of using ANOVA (2x2x2) showed no effect for experience or sex on EFL teachers' reading proficiency level. However, significant effect was indicated for specialization at the .01 level on reading proficiency as shown in table 29, P. 30. Accordingly, hypothesis eight was partly supported and partly rejected.

The t-test results showed that significant differences existed between non-specialist EFL teachers and specialist EFL teachers at the .01 level in favour of specialists (t = 4.19) as indicated in table 30.

Table (29): ANOVA (2x2x2) For Effects and Interaction Between Experience, Sex, Specialization and Reading Proficiency level of Regular EFL Teachers

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
A- Experience	58.73	1	58.73	.96
B- Sex	7.08	1	7.08	.12
C- Speciality	472.51	1	472.51	7.74**
AxB	.04	1	.04	.0007
AxC	8.42	1	8.42	.14
BxC	111.96	1	111.96	1.83
AxBxC	32.63	1	32.63	.53
Within Groups	5129.41	92-8=84	61.06	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (30): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Non-Specialist and Specialist EFL Teachers in Reading Proficiency Level

Groups	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
I- Non-Specialists	20.54	7.56	4.19**
II- Specialists	27.25	8.9	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis nine: There is no interaction between experience, sex, specialization and EFL teachers general reading proficiency level.

Utilizing ANOVA (2x2x2) showed no interaction as indicated in table 29, P. 30. Therefore, hypothesis nine was accepted.

Hypothesis ten: There is no effect for experience, sex, and specialization on EFL teachers' general writing proficiency level.

Employing ANOVA (2x2x2) revealed that there was no effect for both experience and sex on EFL teachers writing proficiency level. However, significant effect was indicated for specialization as shown in table 31. Therefore, hypothesis ten was partly supported and partly accepted.

The t-test showed significant differences existed between non-specialist EFL teachers and specialists at the .01 level in favour of specialist EFL teachers as shown in table 32, P. 32.

Table (31): ANOVA (2x2x2) For Effects and Interaction Between Experience, Sex, Specialization and Writing Proficiency level of Regular EFL Teachers

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
A- Experience	130.99	2-1= 1	130.99	3.60
B- Sex	.81	1	.81	.02
C- Speciality	1647.73	1	1647.73	45.35**
AxB	17.40	1x1=1	17.40	.48
AxC	20.49	1	20.49	.56
BxC	8.60	1	8.60	.24
AxBxC	30.93	1	30.93	.84
Within Groups	3051.70	92-8=84	36.33	

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table (32): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Non-specialist and Specialist EFL Teachers in Writing Proficiency Level

Groups \ Data	$\bar{X}$	SD	t
I- Non-Specialists	20.13	5.75	6.07**
II- Specialists	29.56	9.32	

** Significant at the .01 level.

At this point, it must be mentioned that the results of One Way Analysis of Variance, Three Way Analysis of Variance, and the t-test through-out the whole study indicated that specialist EFL teachers outperformed non-specialist EFL teachers in general language proficiency level (table 2, P. 14), general reading proficiency level (table 4, P. 15), and general writing proficiency level (table 16, P. 22). In addition, specialist EFL teachers did better than non-specialists on the various skills of both reading proficiency and writing proficiency (see table 6, P. 16; table 8, P. 17; table 12, P. 19; table 14, P. 20; table 16, P. 22; table 18, P. 23; table 20, P. 24, table 22, P. 25; table 24, P. 26; and table 26, P. 27).

Hypothesis eleven: There is no interaction between experience, sex, specialization and EFL teachers general writing proficiency level.

ANOVA (2x2x2) showed no interaction as indicated in table 31, P. 31. Accordingly, hypothesis eleven was accepted.

DISCUSSION

The discussion of the results obtained will be presented in four successive parts. Part one includes results pertinent to EFL teachers general Language proficiency level, part two deals with EFL teachers proficiency level in reading and its sub-skills; part three covers the results of EFL teachers proficiency level in writing and its sub-skills; and part four is devoted to discussing the results related to the effects of experience, sex and specialization on language proficiency level, reading proficiency level and writing proficiency level. Interaction will also be discussed in this part.

I- Results related to EFL teachers' general language proficiency level:

The results of using ANOVA and the t-test revealed significant differences between EFL teachers groups. Prospective EFL teachers outperformed both specialist and non-specialist EFL teachers in general language proficiency level. It was expected that specialist EFL teachers would perform better than both prospective EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers. When prospective EFL teachers outperform specialist EFL teachers, this might be interpreted that specialist EFL teachers' language proficiency level is declining or rather deteriorating. This deterioration may be attributed to some reasons which may be summed up as follows:

(a) Admission Policy in Faculties of Education at present: Most Faculties of Education admit students to the English Department who meet minimum entracne requirements. In the academic years 1984, 1985 and 1986, the English Department at Kafr El-Sheikh Faculty of Education allowed students who failed the English language course in the Thanawiyya Amma to join this special department (Admission Office at Kafr El-Sheikh Faculty of Education, 1986, personal communication). This phenomenon is not endemic to Egypt alone.

Haberman (1972) in a survey of 386 member institutions of the National Council for the Accrediatation of Teacher Education found that 344 of them rely heavily pon minimum cumulative grade-point averages and aceept almost any one who applies. Twa and Greene (1980) support the widely held view in the academic community that some teacher-training programmes admit almost anyone who meets minimum entrance requirements.

(b) Inadequacy of EFL Programmes: Over the past decade, government agencies and the public have been exerting strong pressure to reverse what is perceived as a sharp decline in the quality of EFL teachers. In many places, charges have been made that the quality of EFL teachers in terms of academic competence is declining. This may be attributed to inadequacy of EFL programmes both in quality and quantity. This point was made clear by Elewah (1978, P. 10) who stated that "The marked deterioration of the English language standard in our schools could be attributed to the poor qualification of the teachers who teach the English Language classes". Jorstad (1981, PP. 53-54) also pointed out that "Programmes to train teachers for work in bilingual and ESL situations ..... are inadequate both in number and quality". She concluded that "there is marked lack of preparation of teachers for language programmes..... Bilingual and ESL teachers are often not trained for their special responsibilities" (P. 56). At this point, Badr (1984) indicated that "there is a common complaint of low standard of English among EFL teachers in Egypt. Through an analysis of the English Department curriculum in Faculties of Education, he found that the English courses taught were not adequate in quantity or quality to provide the student teachers with the desired language proficiency. White (1986, P. 2) also stated that "Egypt has a huge number of English instructors whose background in language teaching is weak and whose command of the language may be limited".

(c) EFL teachers' contact with native speakers of English is rare or rather not available. As a result, the language of those teachers is exposed to loss because of lack of exposure to the target language. In addition, language skills, like other skills, need to be practiced and applied regularly in order to fully develop. Under certain circumstances, the opportunities for using native language are extensive in non-school settings. On the other hand, opportunities to practice a foreign language may be limited to a few hours daily, usually in the classroom.

(d) Disatisfaction and stress on the part of the teachers: EFL teachers' language proficiency level may be declining because of dissatisfaction, stress and burnout. A number of studies conducted throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s revealed that most teachers are dissatisfied (Fuller and Miskel, 1972; Bentzen, Williams, and Heckman, 1980). A nation wide poll of teachers conducted by the National Education Association in the U.S. in 1980 found that 35 percent of all public school teachers were dissatisfied with their current jobs. Teachers' stress and burnout were also preceived to be symptoms of dissatisfaction. Maslach (1978) defined burnout as emotional exhaustion caused by job stress. Among the most important indicators of burnout were a. loss of concern for the people with whom one works; and dehumanized perception of students, accompanied by deterioration in the quality of teaching, increased use of sick leave; and efforts to leave the profession (Walsh, 1979). To clarify, a number of studies into the causes of teacher dissatisfaction were carried out. Some of these causes were salary and status of teachers in the community (National Education Association, 1980). Ford (1979) believed that faculty work loads may be related to teacher dissatisfaction. Glass et al. (1979) and Pagel and Price (1980) also found out in their study of 130 teachers that tedious paper and clerical work,

disruptive and unmotivated students, feelings of failure and low occupational prestige were among the factors contributing to job dissatisfaction. In closing, Altman (1981, P. 18) maintained that "a second language teacher, in many cases, teaches more than 150 students in six different classes everyday while trying to remain both same and cheerful despite being overworked and underpaid".

With regard to non-specialist EFL teachers, it was expected that they would come last in their general language proficiency level not to mention their general reading and writing proficiency. The findings of the present study supported this expectation (see table 2, P. 19 ; table 4, P. 15 ; and table 16, P. 22 in this volume). This may be due to the fact that they have not studied the language in specialized programmes or received sufficient or adequate training to prepare them for their special responsibilities. They have studied the language as a separate subject for two or four academic years in departments other than English (Sociology, History, Geography or Philosophy Departments, etc.). In other words, they were not well qualified or well trained for teaching the language. They were employed by the Ministry of Education to teach the English Language courses in their schools on a temporary emergency basis (Elewah, 1978).

On the contrary, prospective EFL teachers' outperformance of both specialist and non-specialist EFL teachers may be attributed to the impact of college experience on prospective EFL teachers. It provided them with skills in the language, confidence and motivation. In this concern, Alexander and Eckland (1974, P. 575) pointed out that "the amount of exposure to college environment had a direct effect on students' motivation for high achievement". Joyce, et al. (1977) indicated that at the conclusion of student teaching, a majority of student teachers feel competent in classroom

management, in teaching their speciality and in relationships with colleagues. To clarify; prospective EFL teachers were in contact with the language whereas specialist EFL teachers might have lost some of their language because of lack of exposure to the language when they left college and started teaching at schools. As time passes, specialist EFL teachers focus their efforts on studying the set books only paying no heed to developing or improving their language skills. Most EFL teachers spend their time giving private tutoring so as to earn their livelihood and improve their living conditions. Accordingly, their standard in the language is liable to deterioration. In addition, these specialist EFL teachers are always busy teachers with large classes, pitifully small salaries or examination systems that concentrate on minutiae grammar and on translation. How can one expect them to develop competence or become proficient in the language? Finocchiaro (1973), stated that it is not a teacher's fault to be of poor standard. She attributed this state of affairs to outside factors which she didn't clarify. She also maintained that "no one is born a superior teacher" (1988, P. 5). At this point, Muawad (1986) put it clearly that EFL teachers should" strive to the target language well. It is a life time work to maintain and improve your command of English ...." (PP. 8-9). To end, research work should be undertaken to help EFL teachers whether they are specialist or non-specialists develop their language proficiency level in the four language skills. Further research works should be carried to identify the different factors underlying their poor standard. As it was made clear by Finocchiaro (1988, PP. 2-5)", the heart of any successful EFL learning program is the informed classroom teacher". To help him grow, he should "be aware of his own strengths and perhaps weaknesses". Since the teacher's standard is declining, educational institutions preparing persons to teach should ensure that licensees possess particular competencies before being permitted to practice the profession.

Allen (1979, P. 5) stated that "an EFL teacher should possess competent preparation consisting of completion of a program leading to a degree in teaching English as a second language". He also pointed out that "Barbers today cannot practic surgery (at least delibrately!) but there still are plenty of people teaching English in our discipline without any academic preparation in the field at all" (P. 5). Therefore, he insisted that all EFL teachers must receive formal academic training.

II- Results related to EFL teachers' reading proficiency and its sub-skills:

The results of using ANOVA and the t-test revealed that prospective EFL teachers out-performed both specialist EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers in general reading proficiency level and in most reading sub-skills (see table 4, P.15 ; table 6, P.16 ; table 8, P.17 ; table 10, P.18 ; table 12; P.19 ; and table 14, P.20). This may be attributed to:

(a) Prospective EFL teachers' experience in reading the literature of the language, and in studying the various courses in linguistics, and language skills. In this concern, Rivers (1981) put it clearly that "experience with a considerable quantity of reading material is essential.... to expand the student's knowledge of the language. This will give them experience with a much wider range of expressions and structures than they could gain from listening and speaking... (P. 262)." Prospective EFL teachers are exposed to 19 hours per week devoted to studying the English courses in the first and second years, and the 14 hours per week in the third and fourth years (Statute of the Faculty of Education, Tanta University, P. 7, no date).

On the contrary, the majority of specialist EFL teachers spend their time giving private tutoring which does

not leave them any time for adequate preparation or even improving their language proficiency level (see some other reasons on PP. 35-36 in this volume).

To add, a prerequisite to reading is general language ability. The results of the present study indicated that prospective EFL teachers' general language proficiency level was better than both specialist and non-specialist teachers (see table 2, P. 14). On the basis of this result, it was not surprising that prospective EFL teachers outperformed the two other groups in reading proficiency and some related sub-skills.

(b) Prospective EFL teachers' motivation, and interest in reading activity. Their success at college is determined by their proficiency in reading as well as reading sub-skills. For many university students majoring in English, reading proficiency is crucial and very significant for their academic success. Reading is both the primary means by which they become acquainted with the content of the English courses they are studying and the most important way in which they continue to develop their knowledge of the language itself.

(c) The nature of the reading activity. Rivers and Temperley (1979, P. 187) stated that "Reading is completely individual activity and learners in the same course may be reading at different levels of difficulty in English, just as they do in their native language". To clarify, it was not expected that specialist EFL teachers would come second in their reading proficiency level not to mention its sub-skills. However, it was expected that non-specilaists would come last in their reading proficiency level. This is because studying the language was not their major or area of concentration. Therefore, differences in reading proficiency level may be due to the nature of the reading activity.

In conclusion, this author would like to cite Farr (1969, PP. 52-64) who pointed out that "Particular sets of conditions would affect reading. As examples of these conditions, he listed the selected reading passages, types of questions, environmental conditions for reading and most important the reader's purpose, mental set and command of basic reading skills". This point, however, needs further research.

III- Results related to writing proficiency and its sub-skills:

Using ANOVA and the t-test indicated that specialist EFL teachers outperformed prospective EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers in both wiriting proficiency and its sub-skills (see table 16, P. 22; table 18, P. 23; table 20, P. 24; table 22, P. 25; and table 26; P.27). This may be interpreted that:

(a) Writing is a skill which is difficult to acquire, it requires considerable practice on the part of the learner Byrne (1981 , P. 4) stated that "Writing is commonly a difficult activity for most people, both in the mother tongue and in a foreign language". Rivers (1981, P. 291) also pointed out that "examination papers in composition the world over are, with few exceptions, disappointing. Many college and university students with four, five even six or more years of study of another language behind them are still unable to express themselves in a clear, correct and comprehensible manner in writing". She also stated that "some of the scripts submitted to publishers by university professors and professional writers need considerable editorial revision (P. 309)." At this point, Allen and Valette (1977, P. 284) commented that" it takes many years of intensive study to write a second language fluently. Even most American language teachers who read

with facility the foreign language they teach do not feel qualified to express themselves in writing with the same ease as in English". Accordingly, one should not be surprised;then, that specialist EFL teachers out-performed both prospective EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers in writing proficiency and most of its sub-skills.

(b) Writing is a skill which must be well taught and practiced. This means that it cannot develop haphazardly to any degree of usefulness. Therefore, prospective EFL teachers;and not to mention non-specialist EFL teachers' weaknesses in both writing proficiency and most of its sub-skills may be traced back to lack of systematic instruction and systematic practice during the earlier stages of the language study.

In other words, prospective EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers' weaknesses may be attributed to the inefficiency of the writing programme involved in developing their writing skills. This author attended and observed many essay lectures for the sample employed in the present study. He found out that lecturers used to ask the learners to write about some topic on his/her mind without having any goals or approaches in mind. The learners, in turn, go home and write down as many lines as they can. In class, they are asked to read what they have written orally in front of all the audience. To get the utmost benefit of it, the audience are commanded to listen attentively, to make no comments, and not to disturb the reader or waste the time of the lecture. Accordingly, prospective EFL teachers' standard in writing was not as good as that of specialist EFL teachers. As it was mentioned before, the writing programme was not carefully planned to develop prospective EFL teachers' writing proficiency. This author, however, would like to mention that a crowded lecture with 200 or 250 learners

prevents real teaching and teaching becomes impossible. It will prevent the lecturer from dealing with individual differences or remedying individual weaknesses. Writing is learned through a careful process of instruction. One has to learn certain structures which are less used in speech, or perhaps not used at all but which are important for effective communication in writing. One also has to learn well how to organize his/her ideas in such a way that they can be understood by a reader who is not present or not known to us. In other words, the teaching of writing presents problems. Some instructors often do not have clearly in mind what should be accomplished. Many have only a general objective in mind - for instance - helping learners develop their writing skill and aiding them to become better writers. Consequently, they often proceed to teach writing rather haphazardly without having valid criteria for determining methods and techniques of teaching to be used. One may say, no systematic provision has been made for the development of prospective EFL teachers writing and writing skills; there has been no real programme or real teaching.

With regard to non-specialist EFL teachers' performance in writing and its related sub-skills, it was expected that they would have problems in this area. The results support this expectation. To be fair, this group of EFL teachers have their excuse for their low level in writing, it is not their fault to be of poor standard. They have not studied English well in their undergraduate education. Some may have taken only one or two English courses in the faculty. Only a small number might have had intensive English training at one of the better training centers. Above all, English is not their area of specialization. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to expect them to perform well in the language in general and in reading or writing in particular.

To conclude, one shouldn't be surprized that specialist EFL teachers were more proficient in writing and its sub-skills

than both prospective EFL teachers and non-specialist EFL teachers. Specialist EFL teachers acquired experience and reasonable degree of proficiency in written expression through experiences of scoring many many samples of work written by their students in preparatory and secondary schools. To add, many EFL specialist teachers spend most of their time in class teaching formal English and practice makes perfect. Most of the teachers in this study are products of a system which regards formal written English as the most correct form of the language. If one took it for granted that prospective EFL teachers are familiar with all the basics and devices of written expression, they would still have to learn well how to use them in writing. Writing requires both an extensive understanding of the basics of writing and considerable practice in using them. Writing whole essays or compositions with no errors in spelling or grammar is very complex task. At this point, Daoud and Straker (1986, P. 10) stated that students samples of work are so full of basic grammatical errors, limited vocabulary and poor spelling .... " They also pointed out that "English graduates from both Education and Arts Faculties show a disturbing trend in their abilities....". Rivers and Temperley (1979, P. 263) indicated that "a high level of written expression is so difficult to attain in a foreign language, it can not be achieved by chance". In closing, research in Writing (Mohan and Lo, 1985, PP. 515-522) showed that competence in the organization of written discourse develops late and that appropriate instruction has an impact of this competence. This area, however, needs further research .

IV- <u>Results related to the effect and interaction between experience, sex, specialization and general language proficiency level, general reading proficiency and general writing proficiency</u>:

Using ANOVA (2x2x2) and the t-test revealed that both experience and sex had no effect on general language proficiency

level, or on reading proficiency or writing proficiency. However, the results indicated a significant effect for specialization on general language proficiency and on both reading and writing proficiency as shown in table 27, P. 28 ; table 28, P. 29 ; table 29, P. 30 ; table 30, P. 30 ; table 31, P. 31 and table 32, P. 32 .

This may be interpreted that male EFL teachers' general language proficiency level, general reading and general writing proficiency level was similar to that of female EFL teachers. Research work by Carroll (1968) supports this finding. However, research work by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that females excel at tasks requiring verbal power, including both receptive and productive language. Snow (1988, personal communication) also stated that "females do better than males in language learning tasks. To clarify, it is not wise to generalize that male EFL teachers was similar to female EFL teachers because of the small sample of female EFL teachers (N = 16). This point, however, needs further study.

Experience also was found to have no effect on EFL teachers' language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency. This result is not surprising because, whatever the years of experience, it would make no difference if the teachers' standard is very low. It was clear from the results that prospective EFL teachers out-performed specialist EFL teacher although it was expected that specialist EFL teachers would come first in their language level.

With regard to specialization, it is taken for granted that a teacher's specilization would affect his/her language proficiency level. The results of the present study supported this assumption. Specialist EFL teachers did better than non-specialist EFL teachers in general language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency not to mention their related sub-skills.

The results of using ANOVA (2x2x2) showed no interactions between experience, sex, specialization and language proficiency. This means that there was no common effect for sex, experience and specialization on EFL teachers language level. This may be due to the fact that sex and experience had no effect on EFL teachers language level as it was made clear in table 27, P. 28; table 24, P. 30; and table 31; P. 31. This area, however, needs further researches.

CONCLUSION

The feasibility of generalizing conclusions obtained from empirical researches of behaviour of this nature are restricted by two factors; i.e. the size of the sample and the way the sample selected. On the basis of these two factors, one has to be very cautious when making any generalization of the results of this study. The fact that only 16 female EFL teachers (6 specialist and 10 non-specialists) were examined means that the data were obtained from a small sample. In addition, the data were obtained from groups of EFL teachers who were present on the days of testing and not from a random sample. Accordingly, conclusions obtained from these data have to be considered cautiously.

Another limitation has to be mentioned. A satisfactory set of operational definitionsof proficiency in a language do not exist. There is no single definition of language proficiency on which all researchers and language experts agree. Therefore, the highest level of language acquistion, in writing or reading, is proficiency on the assumption that if the testees can do that, they can do anything. To clarify, the research findings may not be appropriate for all EFL teachers. However, they may be applicable to comparable EFL teachers in comparable settings.

On the basis of the limitations presented, the following conclusions may be drawn from the present study:

(a) Prospective EFL teachers out-performed both non-specialist and specialist EFL teachers in general language proficiency level and that specialist EFL teachers did better than non-specialist EFL teachers.

(b) Prospective EFL teachers performance level in general reading proficiency and most of its sub-skills was superior to that of specialist and non- specialist EFL teachers. Specialists did better than non-specialists in this area.

(c) Specialist EFL teachers out-performed both prospective EFL teachers and non-specialists in general writing proficiency and most of its related sub-skills. Prospective EFL teachers performance was superior to that of non-specialists in this area.

(d) There was no effect for experience or sex on general language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency. However, there was an effect for specialization. Moreover, there were no interactions between experience, sex, specialization and language proficiency level.

On the basis of the previous findings, one may conclude that teachers of English must be proficient in the language they are going to teach. Non-specialist EFL teachers must not be allowed to teach the language classes in schools by any means. They must receive intensive training before they join the profession and the Ministry of Education must make sure that those teachers are up to required level to successfully practice the profession.

In addition, educational institutions preparing persons to teach English as a foreign language must ensure that lincensess possess particular competencies before being

permitted to practice the profession. In other words, it is time that teachers like physicians must pass tests before they are allowed to practice teaching; i.e. there must be entry tests for them and Faculties of Education and Arts should admit only those with high English proficiency test scores into their English Depatments.

Finally much remains for developing more valid and reliable language tests to measure EFL teachers' and EFL learners' language proficiency levels. Much remains for researchers to reveal about the exact nature of language proficiency, reading proficiency and writing proficiency. Finally, this author would like to cite Muawad (1986, PP. 8-9) who put it clearly that "Teaching is a noble calling: it can never be rewarded in terms of money alone, but through the self-satisfaction of performing one's professional tasks thoroughly". He recommends EFL teachers to strive to the target language well and to improve their command of English so as to offer their students a perfect model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Hany A. Azzer, Associate professor of Linguistics, University of Tanta, and Zakarya H. Bishay, Assistant professor of TEFL, University of Tanta for scoring the many many samples of compositions of the study. I am particularly thankful to Mr. Youssef Abd El-Gayed, Teaching Assistant, University of Tanta for help rendered willingly in tests administration.

The author is especially grateful to Dr. Richard E. Baecher and Mr. David Caulfield for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this research work.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Alexander, K. and Eckland, B. Sex Differences in the Educational Attainment process. American Sociological Review, 39, 1974.

Allen, E. and Valette, R. Classroom Techniques: Foreign Language and English as a Second Language. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

Allen, H. What It Means to Be a Prefessional in TESOL. Paper Presented at the Closing Meeting of the Institute of American Studies, NYS ESOL BEA Conference, Suny'/ Potsdam, July 1979.

Altman, H. What is Second Language Teaching. In Alatis, J. et al. The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Badr, M. The Effect of Curriculum in Faculties of Education on the English Language Proficiency Among EFL Teachers. Paper Read before the Conference on Teaching Practice held in the Faculty of Education, Banha, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1984.

Badr, M. English Language Competency Among EFL teachers: A Study of the Progress Achieved During the pre-service Training. Paper presented at the 6 th National Symposium on English Teaching in Egypt, March 25-27, 1986.

Bentzen, M.; Williams, R.; and Heckman, P. A Study of Schooling: Adult Experiences in Schools. Phidelta Kappan, 61, 1980.

Byrne, D. Teaching Writing Skills. London: Longman, 1981.

Carroll, J. Foreign Language Proficiency Levels Attained by Language Majors Near Graduation from College. Cambridge, Mass.: Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Harvard Univ. Graduate school of Education, 1968.

Cohen, J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences. London: Academic Press, Inc., 1977.

Cook, B. Preservice Training. Teaching English in Egypt, No. 2, 1986.

Cowan, J. Lexical and Syntactic Research for the Design of EFL Reading Materials. TESOL Quarterly, 8, 1974.

Crewdson, J. Hispanic Influx Moving United States Closer to Bilingualism. New York times, August 8, 1979.

Daoud, A. and Cook, B. The Problem of English Standards. Teaching English in Egypt, No. 2, 1986.

Disputes Embarrass Dallas's Educators: Low Teacher Scores Disclosed. New York Times, July 23, 1978.

Elewah, A. An Important Report from the Ministry of Education: The Standard of the English Language is Below the Zero Level. Cairo: Al-Akhbar, Dec. 16, 1978. (in Arabic).

El-Hinnawy, N. The Education System and Development: Some Perspectives on the Future. Teaching English in Egypt, No. 2, 1986.

El-Sayed, F. Statistical Psychology and the Measurement of Human Mind. Cairo: Dar El-Fikr El-Araby, 1979. (in Arabic).

Eskey, D. Advanced Reading: The Structural Problem. Ensligh Teaching Forum, 9, 1971.

Farr, R. Reading: What can be Measured? Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1969.

Finocchiaro, M. and Bonomo, M. The Foreign Language Learner: A Guide for Teachers. New York: Regents Publishing Company, 1973.

Finocchiaro, M. Teacher Development: A Continuing process. English Teaching Forum, Vol. 26, No. 3, 1988.

Ford, J. Faculty Workload in Public schools. Journal of Thought, 14(1), 1979.

Fuller, R. and Miskel, C. Work Attachments and Job Satisfaction Among Public School Educators. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1972.

Gaies, S. A Comparison of the Classroom Language of ESL Teachers and Their Speech Among Peers. Unpublished Ph. D Dissertation, Indiana: Indiana University, 1977.

Glass, G.; Cahen, L.: Smith, M.; and Filby, N. Class Size and Learning: New Interpretations of the Research Literature. Today's Education, 68(2), 1979.

Guilford, J. Fundamentals Statistic in Psychology and Education. New Yrok: Mc Graw Hill Book Company, 1973.

Haberman, M. Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education. Paper Presented at the Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Chicago, 1972.

Hill, L. Outline Composition Book. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Hinkle, D.; Wiersma, W.; and Jurs, S.G. Applied Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally Publishing Co., 1979.

Jorstad, H. The Preparation of Second Language Teachers in the 1980's. In Alatis, J. et al. The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Joyce, B. et al. Preservice Teacher Education. Palo Alto, California: Lewin and Associates, Inc., 1977.

Koerner, J. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Lado, R. Lado English Series: 1-6 : A Complete Course in English as a Second Language. New York: Regents Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.

Maccob/, E. and Jacklin, C. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Maslach, C. Job Burnout: How People Cope. Public Welfare, 36, 1978.

Mckinley, C. A Study of ESL Reading Difficulties and Their Possible Effects on Academic Achievement. Unpublished M.A. Thesis in TESL. University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.

Mohan, B. and Lo, W. Academic Writing and Chinese Students: Transfer and Developmental Factors. TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1985.

Muawad, W. Some Advice to Novice Teachers of English, Teaching English in Egypt, No. 2, 1986.

National Education Association. Teacher Opinion Poll: Job Satisfaction. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1980.

Nolan, C.; Hayden, C. and Malsbary, R. Principles and Problems of Business Education. Cincinnati: Sout-Western Publishing Company, 1967.

Pagel, S. and Price, J. Strategies to Alleviate Stress. Pointer, 24(2), 1980.

Perren, G. Teachers of English as a Second Language, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Pierce, M. Sentence-level Expectancy as an Aid to Advanced Reading. TESOL Quarterly, 7, 1973.

Politzer, R. Effective Language Teaching: Insights from Research. In Alatis, J. et al. The Second Language classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Rivers, W. Teaching Foreign-Language Skills. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Rivers, W. and Temperley, M. A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Savignon, S. On the other Side of the Desk: A look at Teacher Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976.

Smith, P. and Berger, E. An Assessment of Three EFL Teaching Strategies Utilizing Three Language Lab Systems. Hew Project No. 5-0683, Grant No. OE-7-48-9013-272-, 1968.

Snow, R. Professor of Education and Psychology. California: Stanford University, 1988.

Spencer, S. and Millman, M. Let's Get High School Foreign Language Teachers Back in the University. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 1977.

Strevens, P. Improving the Teacher's Own English. In Perren, G. (ed.) Teachers of English as a Second Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Teacher Opinion Poll: Job Satisfaction. Today's Education, 69(4), 1980.

Teacher Opinion Poll: Attacks on Teachers. Today's Education, 69(3), 1980.

TESOL, Position Paper on the Role of English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education. New York, 1976.

TESOL, Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, 1975.

Tucker, R. The Relationship of Second Language Learning to Second Language Teaching. In Alatis, J. et al. The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Twa, R. and Greene, M. Prediction of Success in Student Teaching as a Criterion for Selection in Teacher Education Programs. Alberta Journal of Educational Research 26, 1980.

Walsh, D. Classroom Stress and Teacher Burnout. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 1979.

White, R. Pyramids and pupils. Teaching English in Egypt, No. 2, 1986.

Wilson, L. Reading in the ESOL Classroom: A Tachinque for Teaching Syntactic Meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 7, 1973.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test

A. I - Protocol of the Test

A. II - Form of the Test

A. III - Test Validity and Reliability

APPENDIX A. I

TEST PLAN

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test
Of Reading Comprehension for Non-Native Speakers
of English

Protocol of the Test

This protocol includes the following:

1- Plan for the test.

2- The Reading Test: general directions, test form, table of specifications, answer sheet, and answer key.

1- Plan for the Test

Testing Purpose: Reading comprehension skills.

Type of Test: General achievement, proficiency and may serve another purpose such as diagnosing EFL/ESL leurners reading comprehension skills.

Population: Non-Native speakers of English (Advanced level).

Prior Language History: 6-10 years of EFL/ESL

Constraint on Test Format: 50 minute maximum time allowance.

Scope of Difficulty: Passages graded in difficulty from high intermediate level to high advanced level, test items reflect a similar progression.

Length: 5 tests, 50 questions; 50 minutes.

Administration Mode: Group.

Equipment Requirements: None.

Item Types: Passage - 5 graded texts, 160-285 words each.
Test Items: All multiple-choice.
Skills Tested: Determining main ideas of the content
Understanding significant details of content.
Drawing conclusions and inference
Understanding structural meaning and syntax.
Determining meaning of words in context.

Scoring: 1 point per question.

Test Validity: It was calculated through using Point Biserial correlation; internal consistency correlation coefficients between each sub-test and the total score, and the internal consistency validation for test sub-tests was also calculated (see tables 1, 2, and 3 in this volume).

Test Reliability: The total test was calculated by using Kuder Richardson 21. It was .79.
The test items and sub-tests reliability was also estimated (see tables 4 and 5 in this volume).

APPENDIX A. II

- TEST FORM
- TEST SPECIFICATIONS
- ANSWER SHEET
- ANSWER KEY

Tanta University
Faculty of Education

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading For Non-Native Speakers Of English

By
Adel I. El-Banna, Ph.D.
EFL Teaching & Testing

Copyright (c) 1986
by Adel I. El-Banna

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading For Non-Native Speakers of English

By
Adel Ibrahim El-Banna, Ph.D.

General Directions:

1- Turn this page when the examiner tells you to do so. This test consists of 50 items and requires approximately 50 minutes of working time.
2- Read the directions which are printed at the beginning of the test carefully, and proceed at once to answer the questions. Do not spend too much time on Any one item. There is a time limit for each item.
3- No questions may be asked after the examination has begun.
4- Do not talk to any one during the test.
5- You must mark all your answers on the separate answer sheet you have been given by putting a circle around the name letter (A, B, C, D) as the answer you have chosen.
6- Mark Only One answer for each question.
7- If you make a mistake or wish to change an answer, be sure to Cross Out your first circle and then put another circle around the letter of the answer you prefer.

Do Not turn this page until you are kindly told to do so.

When you are told to turn the page, read the directions and then go on to the questions.

8- Good Luck !

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test
of Reading For Non-Native Speakers
(50 minutes)

Instructions:

This is a test to show how well you read. There are 5 reading comprehesion passages each followed by several multiple-choice questions. Read each passage carefully and then try to answer the related questions. Choose the one best answer, marked a, b, c or d to each question. If you do not know the answer at first, you may read the passage again, but do not spend too much time on one passage or you will not have enough time to finish. Do Not write in this booklet.

Read the following sample passage:

The holidays are coming soon. We are planning to have a holiday party, but the twins don't want to go because they don't know how to dance well.

Example I: The twins don't want to go to the party because they.....

a- are not feeling well.
b- do not like holidays.
c- are not good dancers.
d- would rather go swimming.

Sample Answer I: a b c d

The correct answer is c. Turn to the answer sheet and circle the correct answer for Example I. Answer all questions in this manner.

As soon as you understand the instructions, begin work on the passages.

Passage I

The 20 th century is a century of change. There are many new occupations and professions today as a result of many new inventions. Before, there were the classical professions of medicine, pharmacy, law, teaching, and dentistry. There were also the classical occupations of carpenter, farmer, sailor, blacksmith, and stonecutter. Now there are many new professions and occupations. For example, highway engineering and automotive repair are two occupations that have developed as a result of the invention of the automobile. Since the invention of television, there have been TV announcers, TV engineers, and TV repairmen. The airplane is another invention that is changing our lives. The people who work for the airlines (pilots, stewardesses, air traffic engineers, etc.) represent many new professions and occupations. There is another important invention that is producing new professions, the electronic computer. The people who work with this exiting invention include computer engineers and computer programmers. The 20 th century is clearly a century of change. There is always something new.

1- According to the passage there are new professions because .....
   a- there are more people.
   b- new inventions make new professions.
   c- there weren't enough professions before.
   d- of unknown reasons.

2- A new profession that has developed from new technology is .....
   a- computer programming
   b- teaching
   c- stone cutting
   d- farming

PLEASE go on to the next page

3- According to the passage, change brings .....
   a- a fast paced life.
   b- too much happiness.
   c- new professions.
   d- nervous problems.

4- "The 20 th century is clearly a century of change. There is always something new". From this one may conclude that the writer is .....
   a- playing a trick.
   b- stating a fact.
   c- telling a lie.
   d- twisting his words.

5- The airplane is antoher invention..... is changing our lives.
   a- who
   b- whose
   c- what
   d- which

6- "There is another important invention that is producing new professions". This means the invention is .....
   a- creating new professions.
   b- preventing new professions.
   c- improving new professions.
   d- destroying new professions.

7- Since the invention of television, there ..... TV announcers, TV engineers, and TV repairmen.
   a- has been
   b- have been
   c- were
   d- was

8- From this passage one may conclude that there were no computer engineers before the 20 th century because.....
   a- computers didn't break down.
   b- there were only a few computers then.
   c- people had other jobs.
   d- there were no computers before 1900.

9- A classical profession before the 20 th century was.....
   a- carpentry.
   b- engineering
   c- repairing.
   d- pharmacy.

PLEASE go on to the next page

10- "The 20 th century is a century of change". There has been change for about.....

a- fifty years
b- eighty years
c- twenty years
d- twenty centuries

Passage 2

Crime rates in the United States are among the highest in modern societies. Over 200,000 prisoners are confined in over 200 state and government prisons and reformatories, and the prison population increases annually by 4500. Prison construction costs almost 45 million dollars annually, a figure rising from year to year. Over 66 percent of the prisoners in this country have previous criminal records. Concerned with the costs, in both financial and human resources, American criminologists have done much research in crime control. In fact, prison systems in most countries are based on the American system developed by these researchers. Many modern theorists suggest that society is the basic cause of crime. Unconventional behaviour is often very rewarding. Men with wealth, power, and prestige are respected regardless of their means of achieving these ends. Cheating on taxes has become common. Society, these experts suggest, encourages criminal behaviour. American criminologists have found that capital punishment, physical abuse, isolation, and permanent stigmas do not correct criminal behaviour. These traditional methods have been replaced by probation, individualized counselling, vocational training, and group psychological therapy, all administered by professional personnel.

11- According to the passage, crime is due to .....

a- poverty.
b- race.
c- societal reward.
d- age.

PLEASE go on to the next page

12- According to the passage, the author believes that wealthy people who commit crimes are often.....

a- punished.
b- isolated.
c- respected.
d- counselled.

13- According to the author, criminal behaviour can be helped by .....

a- counselling.
b- the death penalty.
c- eternal imprisonment.
d- hard work.

14- The amount of people in prison increases yearly by .....

a- fifty four hundred.
b- sixty six per cent.
c- forty five hundred.
d- forty five million.

15- "American criminologists have found that capital punishment and isolation do not correct criminal behaviour". This means .....

a- conventional prisons don't work.
b- isolation reforms criminals.
c- traditional prison usually works.
d- criminals are afraid of death penalty.

16- American criminologists have found that capital punishment and isolation do not correct criminal behaviour means that .....

a- criminals have found
b- police have found
c- people who study crime have found
d- criminals' relatives have found

17- From the passage one may assume that in many countries people who commit crimes now are usually.....

a- phyically punished.
b- counselled.
c- rewarded.
d- highly respected.

18- These traditional methods have been replaced by probation, individualized counseling ..... and group psychological therapy, <u>all administered by professional personnel</u>, i.e, they are administered by

a- sociologists.
b- medical doctors.
c- prison wardens.
d- therapists.

PLEASE go on to the next page

19- One may conclude from the passage that prison sentences usually .....

a- support criminals to lead a peaceful life.
b- control the occurences of violent crimes.
c- rehabilitate professional criminals.
d- create a circle of ex-criminals committing future crimes.

20- Experts suggest that the way a criminal behaves ..... by society.

a- are encouraged.
b- has been encouraged
c- is encouraged.
d- encourages.

Passage 3

When people discuss the weather in a certain region, they are talking about its climate. Each country or region has its own climate. The most important elements of climate are temperature, wind, sunshine, humidity, and rain. Altitude and latitude are especially important factors in climate. Altitude means height. A place located at a high aititude is colder than one at a low altitude. The temperature at the top of a mountain, therefore, will be colder than at the foot of that mountain. Latitude refers to distance from the equator. Latitude determines the position of the sun at noon, as well as the length of the day. At the equator, the sun is directly above and the climate is very hot. At that point on the earth's surface, the amount of sunlight is almost the same on all the days of the year. Near the North Pole, the nights are very long and the days are very short in winter. In summer, the days are longest and the nights shortest. The climate is very cold. Climate is divided into types according to temperature, amount of sunshine, etc. The highest or lowest temperature in an area is not as important as the average temperature. The greatest amount of rain at any one time or the longest period of sunshine without rain are both of scientific interest. Today, weather instruments, weather satellites, and other modern devices send information from high above the earth. This information helps man to predict the weather and to understand better the climate around him.

PLEASE go on to the next page

21- "Altitude and latitude are especially important factors in climate" Altitude and latitude are .....

a- slight factors.
c- considerable factors.
b- negligible elements.
d- trivial elements.

22- Each of the regions has ..... own climate.

a- their
c- its
b- it's
d- his

23- Weather satellites help people to .....

a- ignore the weather.
c- predict the weather.
b- control the weather.
d- none of the above.

24- It is clear from the passage that the weather is .....

a- different in each region.
b- the same everywhere.
c- of little concern to people.
d- governed by man.

25- According to the passage, a country's climate is determined by .....

a- its location relative to the equator.
b- how far east it is.
c- its number of mountain ranges.
d- its lowest temperature.

26- The temperature considered when talking about the climate of a region is .....

a- the highest temperature.
b- the average temperature.
c- the lowest temperature.
d- the temperature when it rains.

27- "Each country has its own climate" Each region has its own .....

a- altitude.
c- weather.
b- humidity.
d- latitude.

PLEASE go on to the next page

28- Latitude ..... the distance from the equator.

a- equals
b- refers
c- mean
d- is

29- "Today, weather instruments and other modern devices send information from high above the earth". From this one may conclude that weather technology is .....

a- new.
b- old.
c- unnecessary.
d- accurate.

30- "Near the North Pole, the nights are long and the days very short in winter". From this one may conclude that in Canada, Alaska days are .....

a- wet.
b- short.
c- long.
d- dry.

Passage 4

War is not the only solution to world problems. Conflicts develop because of geographical barriers, cultural differences, excessive national pride, lack of communication, desire for economic power, and historical hatred. Each of these obstacles to world harmony can be overcome by peaceful negotiations. Geographical factors that characterize national boundaries often contribute to world disharmony in two major ways. First, they often prevent economic development. Thus, valuable mineral deposits or coastal facilities near the boundary between two nations can be a source of conflict. For example, the Alsace-Loraine area, with its rich mineral deposits, has been a source of conflict between France and Germany for hundreds of years. A plan to share these resources would have helped the economy of both nations and could have prevented several wars. Second geographical boundaries emphasize cultural differences. If a man must scale a mountain in order to learn how another

PLEASE go on to the next page

group of men lives, he is not likely to make the necessary effort. Unless he communicates with men of another culture, he cannot understand their way of life. Unless he understands their way of life, he probably will not respect them. Unless he respects them, he will often judge them unfairly. War often results. But cultural differences also include language barriers. Until men can communicate verbally, there can be no deep understanding between them. They cannot learn how their neighbours worship God, why they have a particular form of government, where their loyalities lie, whether or not they accept change readily, or what their interrelationships are. The conflict between the United States and Russia might have been intensified by cultural differences. The united Nations Organization tries to bring people from various cultures together to solve misunderstandings peacefully.

31- "War is not the only solution to world problems". Form this one may conclude that .....
   a- war is the only way to solve problems.
   b- war is the natural course of events.
   c- there can be peaceful solutions to problems.
   d- problems cannot be settled except by war.

32- One may conclude from the passage that the author thinks that .....
   a- the United Nations is an attempt to solve world problems peacefully.
   b- the United Nations has nothing to do with world problems.
   c- the United Nations doesn't work for the sake of peace.
   d- peaceful solutions will never work.

33- According to the passage, world disharmony .....
   a- always ends in violent struggle.
   b- never ends in violent struggle.
   c- can be overcome by peaceful agreements.
   d- is never solved by political agreements.

PLEASE go on to the next page

34- Geographical boundaries emphasize cultural differences means that a mountain range .....

a- separates people.
b- joins people.
c- lessens differences.
d- makes no cultural differences.

35- "Mountainous boundaries often prevent economic development" means that mountain boundaries .....

a- support development.
b- ignore development.
c- hinder development.
d- increase development.

36- According to the passage, men war because of .....

a- conflict over valuable mineral deposits.
b- the inability to communicate.
c- geographical boundaries.
d- all of the above.

37- The author believes war is .....

a- inevitable.
b- unpreventable.
c- unpredictable for some reasons.
d- prevented by mutual understanding.

38- France and Germany's conflict over Alsace-Lorraine has been .....

a- a fight for mineral deposits.
b- a fight that lasted a hundred years.
c- a fight for good farmland.
d- taking place because of language differences.

39- "Men can communicate verbally" means people can .....

a- understand each other.
b- talk to each other.
c- write letters to each other.
d- debate each other.

40- Each of these obstacles..... overcome by peaceful negotiations.

a- are
b- is
c- has
d- have been

PLEASE go on to the next page

Passage 5

Many students have become dissatisfied with their educational experiences. Seeing no meaningful relationship between classroom work and the real outside of school they become bored, discouraged, and disillusioned. Many, in fact, never finish education.Students go to college for several reasons. Some are forced to go; their parents insist. A few go to make friends, to gain prestige, to find a compatible mate. However, most go to college in order to prepare for a profession and a comfortable, fruitful life. What they expect and what they get are too often not the same. Teachers teach for several reasons. Some don't know what else to do, their own college experiences have not prepared them for business or law or engineering or medicine or any other professions. They have been trained in theory only. A mathematics professor, for example, may be fascinated with mathematical theories and may want to do research in his field. He may enter the teaching professions because the hours are short and the summer vacations are long. Thus, he will have time for his research in which he is more interested than in teaching. He often loses contact with the real world of business and industry to which applied (not theoretical) mathematics is very important. But it is applied mathematics that interests most of his students. The same may be said about art and music, history, literature, and the physical and biological sciences. Disillusioned by his "ivory tower" professors, a student once observed that "a good plumber does more for humanity than do all the philosophers". Like many other students, he despised the inability of his teacher" to come out of the clouds" and help him confront the real problems of earning a living.

41- According to the passage, many students are dissatisfied with college because.....

a- classes are too easy.

b- their studies are not applicable to real life.

c- the teachers are boring and badly prepared.

d- it costs too much money.

PLEASE go on to the next page

42- It is clear from the passage that college studies and real life .....
a- are often the same.
b- are often very different.
c- never have anything in common.
d- often have very much in common.

43- People often teach because they .....
a- love teaching.
b- don't know what else to do.
c- get away from the real world.
d- have short summers.

44- "Many students have become dissatisfied with their educational experiences" one may conclude that the students probably feel very .....
a- contented.
b- displeased.
c- angry.
d- nervous.

45- "Most students go to college in order to prepare for a profession" is the same as: Most go to college..... for a profession.
a- if they prepare.
b- though they prepare.
c- that they can prepare.
d- lest they should prepare.

46- "Most of his students ..... in applied mathematics.
a- interested
b- are interesting
c- are intersted
d- have interested.

47- He despised the inability of his teacher to come "out of the clouds" means he disrespected his teacher's inability to .....
a- think unwisely
b- walk straight
c- fly swiftly
d- think realistically.

PLEASE go on to the next page

48- "A student once observed that" a good plumber does more for humanity than do all the philosophers", from this one may conclude that .....

a- the student wants to become a plumber.

b- philosophers are more important than plumbers.

c- plumbers are more important than philosophers.

d- the student wants to become a philosopher.

49- Most students are interested in subjects that are .....

a- applied.

b- theoretical.

c- prestigious.

d- research oriented.

50- Students go to college to gain prestige, means they go to get .....

a- wealth

b- importance

c- intelligence

d- fame.

PLEASE STOP HERE,

END OF TEST

Specifications of The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading For Non-Native Speakers of English

Reading Skills	Item Numbers	Total
1- Determining main ideas of the content	1, 3, 11, 13, 24, 25, 33, 37, 41, 42	10
2- Understanding significant details of content	2, 9, 12, 14, 23, 26, 36, 38, 43, 49	10
3- Drawing conclusions and inferences	4, 8, 17, 19, 29, 30, 31, 32, 44, 48	10
4- Understinding structural meaning and syntax	5, 7, 15, 20, 22, 28, 34, 40, 45, 46	10
5- Determining meaning of words in context	6, 10, 16, 18, 21, 27, 35, 39, 47, 50	10
Total		50

Answer Key

The Five-Skill Language Proficiency Test of Reading for Non-Native Speakers of English.

Passage I		Passage 2		Passage 3	
1-	b	11-	c	11-	c
2-	a	12-	c	22-	c
3-	c	13-	a	23-	c
4-	b	14-	c	24-	a
5-	d	15-	a	25-	a
6-	a	16-	c	26-	b
7-	b	17-	b	27-	c
8-	d	18-	d	28-	d
9-	d	19-	d	29-	b
10-	b	20-	c	30-	b

Passage 4:		Passage 5	
31-	c	41-	b
32-	d	42-	b
33-	c	43-	b
34-	a	44-	b
35-	c	45-	c
36-	d	46-	c
37-	a	47-	d
38-	b	48-	c
39-	b	49-	a
40-	b	50-	b

c 1986 by Adel I. El-Banna

APPENDIX A. III

TEST VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Table 1. Item Validation Using Point-biserial Correlation

Reading Skills	Item No.	r.
1- Determining main ideas of the content	1	.48**
	3	.37*
	11	.39**
	13	.49**
	24	.45**
	25	.46**
	33	.52**
	37	.56**
	41	.43**
	42	.46**
2- Understanding significant details of content	2	.33**
	9	.55**
	12	.48**
	14	.54**
	23	.40**
	26	.51**
	36	.53**
	38	.57**
	43	.49**
	49	.58**

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 1. Cont. Item Validation Using Point biserial correlation

Reading Skills	Item Nl.	r.
3- Drawing conclusions and inferences	4	.36*
	8	.51**
	17	.54**
	19	.49**
	29	.38**
	30	.36*
	31	.43**
	32	.41**
	44	.51**
	48	.56**
4- Understanding structural meaning and syntax	5	.35*
	7	.43**
	15	.55**
	20	.47**
	22	.38**
	28	.53**
	34	.47**
	40	.50**
	45	.53**
	46	.57**

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 1. Cont. Item Validation Using Point-biserial correlation

Reading Skills	Item No.	r.
5- Determining meaning of words in context	6	.38**
	10	.56**
	16	.54**
	18	.52**
	21	.33*
	27	.50**
	35	.49**
	39	.54**
	47	.52**
	50	.48**

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 2. Internal Consistency Correlation Cofficients Between each Subtest and the Total Scores

Reading sub-tests	r. with Total Scores
1- Determining main ideas of the content	.70**
2- Understanding significant details	.73**
3- Drawing conclusions and inferences	.66**
4- Understanding structural meaning	.71**
5- Determining meaning of words	.75**

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 3. Matrix of Internal Consistency Validation For Reading Test Sub-Tests

Reading sub-tests	1	2	3	4	5
1	--	.44**	.41**	.39**	.46**
2		--	.55**	.37**	.40**
3			--	.47**	.49**
4				--	.39**
5					--

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 4. Item Reliability for the Reading Test using Modal Probability

Item No.	r.	Item No.	r.	Item No.	r.
1	.94	21	.81	41	.74
2	.93	22	.77	42	.60
3	.87	23	.80	43	.65
4	.85	24	.86	44	.69
5	.89	25	.72	45	.55
6	.90	26	.65	46	.57
7	.80	27	.68	47	.49
8	.68	28	.48	48	.43
9	.45	29	.29**	49	.32*
10	.55	30	.61	50	.35*
11	.65	31	.70		
12	.59	32	.67		
13	.61	33	.56		
14	.57	34	.61		
15	.39	35	.60		
16	.48	36	.44		
17	.31*	37	.46		
18	.48	38	.49		
19	.27*	39	.23*		
20	.61	40	.27*		

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 5. Reading Skills and Total Test Reliability Using Kuder Richardson 21

Reading Skills	r.
1- Determining main ideas of the content	.59**
2- Understanding significant details of content	.69**
3- Drawing conclusions and inferences	.42**
4- Understanding structural meaning and syntax	.54**
5- Determining meaning of words in context	.58**
- Total Test Reliability	.79**

** Significant at the .01 level.

APPENDIX B

THE WRITING PROFICIENCY TEST

B. I - PROTOCOL OF THE TEST

B. II - FORM OF THE WRITING TEST

B. III - TEST VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

APPENDIX B. I

WRITING TEST PROTOCOL

Writing Proficiency Test

Protocol of the Test

This protocol includes the following:

1- Plan for the test.
2- Criteria for scoring.
3- The writing test: general directions and test.

1- Plan for the test:

Testing purpose: Proficiency, achievement and can be used for placement.

Type of test: Proficiency in writing.

Population: Any EFL/ESL background, high intermediate college level.

Prior Language History: Inter mediate to high advanced level in EFL/ESL.

Constraints on Test format: 60 minute maximum time allowance.

Test content sampling: expert judgement.

Scope of Difficulty: broadly focused.

Overall Length of Item: a writing task taking approximately an hour.

Administrative Mode: group

Equipment Required: None.

Item type: The writing task is not realistic in stimulus but is realistic in response.

Scoring procedures: Holistic scoring by two readers using the ESL composition profile developed by Newbury House Publishers. The five criteria applied to the writing task were: content, organization, vocabulary language use and mechanics.

2- Criteria for Scoring:

CONTENT	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable ⁎ substantive ⁎ thorough development of thesis ⁎ relevant to assigned topic.
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject ⁎ adequate range ⁎ limited development of thesis ⁎ mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject ⁎ little substance ⁎ inadequate development of topic
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject ⁎ non-substantive ⁎ not pertinent ⁎ OR not enough to evaluate
ORGANIZATION	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression ⁎ ideas clearly stated/supported ⁎ succinct ⁎ well-organized ⁎ logical sequencing ⁎ cohesive
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy ⁎ loosely organized but main ideas stand out ⁎ limited support ⁎ logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent ⁎ ideas confused or disconnected ⁎ lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate ⁎ no organization ⁎ OR not enough to evaluate
VOCABULARY	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range ⁎ effective word/idiom choice and usage ⁎ word form mastery ⁎ apporopriate register.
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range ⁎ occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured.
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range ⁎ frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage ⁎ meaning confused or obscured.
	9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation ⁎ little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form ⁎ OR not enough to evaluate.

LANGUAGE USE

25-22 EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions ⁑ few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions.

21-18 GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions ⁑ minor problems in complex constructions ⁑ several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured.

17-11 FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions ⁑ frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and /or fragments, run-ons, deletions ⁑ meaning confused or obscured.

10-5 VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules ⁑ dominated by errors ⁑ does not communicate ⁑ OR not enough to evaluate.

MECHANICS

5 EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions ⁑ few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing.

4 GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured.

3 FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing ⁑ poor handwriting ⁑ meaning confused or obscured.

2 VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions ⁑ dominated by errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing ⁑ handwriting illegible ⁑ OR not enough to evaluate.

Test Validity: It was obtained through using correlation cofficients between each sub-test and the total scores (See table 2 in this volume).

Test Reliability: The total test and the test sub-tests reliability were obtained through using Kuder Richardson 21. (See table 1 in this volume). The interrater reliability achieved was .87

APPENDIX B. II

WRITING TEST FORM

A Writing Proficiency Test for
Non-Native Speakers of English

- - - -

General Directions:

The purpose of this test is to determine how well you can write correct English. The readers who score this test will consider your ability to write clearly and correctly. Content, organization of ideas, vocabulary, language use and mechanics (punctuation, capitalization and spelling) will be considered. You will have as much time as you need. There is, however, a suggested time shown on the test sheet.

- No questions may be asked after the examination has begun.
- Do not talk to any one during the examination.
- When you are told to turn this page, Read the instructions which appear on the first page carefully and then proceed at once to write your composition.
- Do not turn this page until you are told to do so.
- Good Luck!

Writing Proficiency Test

(40-50 Minutes)

Instructions:

You are asked to write a composition on the topic below. Write as much as you can. Write your composition on the lines below. You can use scratch paper to make notes or an outline. You may also use the guiding question given below.

Topic:

Imagine that you have seen a road accident and that the police have asked you to write a report on it, so that they can decide who was to blame. Write the report, saying:

(a) the date and exact time of the accident;
(b) the place where it happened (draw a simple map, if you can, and refer to it in your report).
(c) exactly where you were at the time of the accident, and how far you could see in each direction from there;
(d) what cars, trucks, motor-cycles, bicycles, and people on foot had anything to do with the accident;
(e) exactly how it happened (the position of all the cars, people, & c. when you first noticed them; what each did after that; how they finished up, & c. Show the positions and movements of the cars, people, & c. on your map, if you can);
(f) the speeds at which you think the various cars, & c. were going;
(g) what happened to each of them (which were damaged/ hurt, what damage/injuries they received, & c.);
(h) whose fault you think the accident was;
(i) how you think the accident could have been avoided.

APPENDIX B. III

TEST VALIDITY & RELIABILITY

Table 1. Writing Skills and Total Test Reliability Using Kuder Richardson 21

Writing Skills	r.
1- Content	.56**
2- Organization	.49**
3- Vocabulary	.50**
4- Language use	.69**
5- Mechanics	.76**
Total Test Reliability	.84**

Table 1. Cont. Writing Test Reliability

Inter rater reliability	.87**

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 2. Writing Skills Validation Using Correlation Coefficients Between Each Sub-test and the Total Scores

Writing Sub-Tests	r.
1- Content	.63**
2- Organization	.58**
3- Vocabulary	.67**
4- Language Use	.76**
5- Mechanics	.81**

** Significant at the .01 level.

Appendix C

Samples of English Department Candidates who Failed the English Language Course in the Thanawiyya Amma

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية			مجموعة الرياضيات			مجموعة العلوم الطبيعة ـ الكيمياء			التاريخ الطبيعى	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	اللغة الدينية	المستوى الخاص	المقررات	
		اللغة الأجنبية الأولى والترجمة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	الجبر وحساب المثلثات والتكامل	التفاضل والتكامل	الهندسة	المجموع	الطبيعة	الكيمياء					عادى	من
النهاية الكبرى	٥٠	٤٠	٣٠	٧٠	٣٠	٢٥	٢٥	٨٠	٦٠	٦٠	١٢٠	٨٠	٤٠٠	٢٠	١٠	لاى العبلاتو
النهاية الصغرى	٢٥	١٢	٩	٢١	—	—	—	٢٢	١٨	١٨	٤٨	٢٢	٢٠٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة ..	٢٩	١٧	٢٠	٣٧	١٨	١٧	١٧½	٢٧½	٢٤½	٢٤½	٧٦	٦٦½	٢٥٦	١٠	واحد	/

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية ٢٢ ١٠ ـ ١١٠٥٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) عائتان وستة وخمسون فقط لا غير

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف)

كتبه ابراهيم املاه محمد راجع الكتابة محمد راجع الإملاء

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة : ١ ـ لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ ـ يعمل بهذه الاشارة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب متى كان معدلا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح » .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية			مجموعة الرياضيات			مجموعة العلوم الطبيعة ـ الكيمياء			التاريخ الطبيعى	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	اللغة الدينية	المستوى الخاص	المقررات	
		اللغة الأجنبية الأولى والترجمة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	الجبر وحساب المثلثات والتكامل	التفاضل والتكامل	الهندسة	المجموع	الطبيعة	الكيمياء					عادى	من
النهاية الكبرى	٥٠	٤٠	٣٠	٧٠	٣٠	٢٥	٢٥	٨٠	٦٠	٦٠	١٢٠	٨٠	٤٠٠	٢٠	١٠	لاى العبلاتو
النهاية الصغرى	٢٥	١٢	٩	٢١	—	—	—	٢٢	١٨	١٨	٤٨	٢٢	٢٠٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة ..	٣٠½	١٦	١٦	٣٢	٢٢	١٩½	١٥½	٥٨	٤٣	٤٣½	٨٦½	٥٩½	٢٦٦½	١٤	—	—

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية ٢٢ ١٠ ـ ١١٠٥٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) هاشم وستون وستون ونصف درجة

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف)

كتبه محمد املاه محمد راجع الكتابة راجع الإملاء

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة : ١ ـ لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ ـ يعمل بهذه الاشارة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب متى كان معدلا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح » .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى والثانية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: الجغرافيا	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: علم النفس	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	القدرات فنون
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لائق/غير لائق
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٣٢	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٤٢½	٢٤½	١٨	٤٢½	٢٠	٢٧	٤٧	١٩	١٩½	٣٨½	١٧٠½	١٤	٥	/

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) مائة وسبعون درجة ونصف فقط

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) خمس درجات فقط

كتبه [illegible] املاء [illegible] راجع الكتابة [illegible] راجع الإملاء [illegible]

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب

٢ — يعمل بهذه الاستمارة لمدة سنة واحدة فقط من تاريخ إصدارها ويجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب متى كان معدلا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح »

أما الدليل الرسمى للنجاح فهو الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بتقديمها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى والثانية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: المجموع	مجموعة الرياضيات: الجبر وحساب المثلثات والتكامل	مجموعة الرياضيات: الهندسة التحليلية	مجموعة الرياضيات: المجموع	مجموعة العلوم: الفيزياء	مجموعة العلوم: الكيمياء	مجموعة العلوم: المجموع	تاريخ فلسفى	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	القدرات: صوت	القدرات: صورة
النهاية الكبرى	٥٠	٤٠	٣٠	٧٠	٢٠	٢٥	٨٠	٦٠	٦٠	١٢٠	٨٠	٤٠٠	٢٠	١٠	لائق/غير لائق	
النهاية الصغرى	٢٥	١٢	٩	٢١	—	—	٣٢	١٨	١٨	٤٨	٢٢	٢٠٠	١٠	٥		
الدرجة	٢٦½	١٨	٢٠	٣٨	١٧½	١٤½	٢٩½	٢١½	٢٩½	٩١	٦٠	٧٧٥	١٤	٤	لائق	—

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) [illegible]

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) [illegible]

كتبه [illegible] املاء [illegible] راجع الكتابة [illegible] راجع الإملاء [illegible]

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعمل بهذه الاستمارة لمدة سنة واحدة فقط من تاريخ إصدارها ويجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب متى كان معدلا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح » .

أما الدليل الرسمى للنجاح فهو الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بتقديمها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى المقررة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية العملية	المستوى الخاص	التقدير فنون
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توقع الجهة الفنية
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٤	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٣٥	٢٩	٣١	٦٠	٣٤½	٢٤	٥٨½	١٤	١٤	٢٨	١٨١½	١٤	—	—

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية ١٩٧٣/٢٠٠٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) ..... مائة واحد وثمانون ونصف

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) .....

كتبه ..... أملاه ..... راجع الكتابة ..... راجع الإملاء .....

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعمل بهذه الشهادة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان مصدقا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح » .
أما الدليل الرسمى للنجاح فهو الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بتقديمها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى المقررة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية العملية	المستوى الخاص	التقدير فنون
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توقع الجهة الفنية
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٤	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٤١	٢٩	٢١	٦٠	٢٢	٢٧	٤٩	١٤	١٣	٢٥	١٧٥	١٧½	٤	

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأ ... ١٩٧٣/٢٠٠٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) مائة وخمس وسبعون درجة

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) .....

كتبه ..... أملاه ..... راجع الكتابة ..... راجع الإملاء .....

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعمل بهذه الشهادة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان مصدقا عليها ومختومة بخاتم « ناجح » .
أما الدليل الرسمى للنجاح فهو الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بتقديمها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى المقررة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	القدرات فنون
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لائق/غير لائق
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٢	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٤١	٢٥	٢١	٤٦	٢٢	٢٥	٤٧	١٥	١٤	٢٩	١٦٣	١٤	/	/

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية ٢١/٧٨٣ - ١٥٠٠٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) [illegible] درجة

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) ——————

كتبه [illegible] أملاه [illegible] راجع الكتابة [illegible] راجع الإملاء [illegible]

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

[illegible]

ملاحظة :

١ — لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعطى بهذه الاشارة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان معدلا عليها ومختوم بخاتم « ناجح » .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى المقررة	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	القدرات فنون
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لائق/غير لائق
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٢	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٢٨	٢٥	٢٥	٥٠	١٩	١٩	٣٨	١٢	٧ ١/٢	٢٠ ١/٢	١٤٦ ١/٢	١٣	—	

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية ٢٢٩/١٩٨٢ - ١٥٠٠

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) [illegible]

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) ——————

كتبه [illegible] أملاه [illegible] راجع الكتابة [illegible] راجع الإملاء [illegible]

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

[illegible]

ملاحظة :

١ — لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعطى بهذه الاشارة لمدة سنة وهى مجرد إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان معدلا عليها ومختوم بخاتم « ناجح » .

أما الدليل الرسمى لنجاح أو للشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بتقديمها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية			مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية			مجموعة المواد الفلسفية			المجموع الكلى للمادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	التقديرات فنون
		اللغة الأجنبية الأولى	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع				
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توا/جيد تو
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٤	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدوجة	٣٧	٢٥	٢٨	٥٣	٢٢	٢٦	٤٨	١٥	١٦	٣١	١٦٩	١٤	١	١

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) مائة وسبعة وستون درجة

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) ——

كتبه محمد خطاب أملاه ابراهيم محمد راجع الكتابة محمد درويش راجع الإملاء محمد خطاب

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

أحمد عزت

ملاحظة :

١ — تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعدل [illegible] سنة ومن تجاوز إعطاء نجاح الطالب من كان مصدقا لها ومختوما بخاتم « ناجح » .

أما الحاصل على الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بفقدها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية			مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية			مجموعة المواد الفلسفية			المجموع الكلى للمادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	التقديرات فنون
		اللغة الأجنبية الأولى	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع				
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توا/جيد تو
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٢٤	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدوجة	٣٥	٢٦½	٣٢	٥٨½	٢٥	٢٧	٥٢	١٠	١٤	٢٤	١٦٩½	١٢	٥	—

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) مائة وسبعة وستون درجة ونصف

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) ——

كتبه حمدى سيد أحمد أملاه صبرى الدمنهورى راجع الكتابة سيد ١٠ — راجع الإملاء [illegible]

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

أحمد عزت

ملاحظة :

١ — تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يعدل [illegible] سنة ومن تجاوز إعطاء نجاح الطالب من كان مصدقا لها ومختوما بخاتم « ناجح » .

أما الحاصل على الشهادة ، ويجب المطالبة بفقدها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	الدرجات فوق
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توافر / توافر
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٣٢	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	=	
الدرجة	٢٩	٢٧	٣٢	٦٠	١٨	٢٠	٣٨	١١	٧	٢٨	١٦٥	١٥	/	/

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) ...

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) .....

كتبه ..... أملاه ..... راجع الكتابة ..... راجع الإملاء .....

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يمثل بهذه الاستمارة لجنة ورئيس لجنة إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان معدلا دائما ومختوما بخاتم « ناجح » .

درجات الطالب فى الامتحان

البيان	اللغة العربية	مجموعة اللغات الأجنبية: اللغة الأجنبية الأولى	اللغة الأجنبية الثانية	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الاجتماعية: التاريخ	الجغرافيا	المجموع	مجموعة المواد الفلسفية: الفلسفة والمنطق	علم النفس	المجموع	المجموع الكلى للمستوى العادى	التربية الدينية	المستوى الخاص	الدرجات فوق
النهاية الكبرى	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	١٠٠	٤٠	٤٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	٤٠	٢٨٠	٢٠	١٠	لا توافر / توافر
النهاية الصغرى	٣٠	١٨	١٢	٤٠	١٢	١٢	٣٢	—	—	١٦	١٤٠	١٠	٥	
الدرجة	٣٥½	٢٦	٣٠½	٥٦½	٣٠	١٦	٢٦	١٤	١٥	٢٩	١٥٧	١١	/	/

الهيئة العامة لشئون المطابع الأميرية

مجموع درجات الطالب فى المستوى العادى (بالحروف) ....

درجة الطالب فى المستوى الخاص (بالحروف) .....

كتبه ..... أملاه ..... راجع الكتابة ..... راجع الإملاء .....

توقيع رئيس لجنة النظام والمراقبة

ملاحظة :

١ — لا تعتبر مواد المستوى الخاص مواد رسوب .

٢ — يمثل بهذه الاستمارة لجنة ورئيس لجنة إخطار بنجاح الطالب من كان معدلا دائما ومختوما بخاتم « ناجح » .

أما الدليل الرسمى لنجاح فهو الشهادة ، ويجب المذاكرة إليها فى مدى سنة من تاريخ النجاح .